arXiv:1103.1196v1 [math.AP] 7 Mar 2011

A regularity criterion for the Navier-Stokes equations via two entries of the velocity Hessian tensor

Zujin Zhang[1,*]

Department of Mathematics, Sun Yat-sen University
Guangzhou 510275, Guangdong, P.R. China

Abstract

We consider the Cauchy problem for the incompressible Navier-Stokes equations in $\boldsymbol{R}^3$, and provide a sufficient condition to ensure the smoothness of the solution. It involves only two entries of the velocity Hessian.

Keywords: Incompressible Navier-Stokes equations, regularity criterion, global regularity, weak solutions, strong solutions
2010 MSC: 35Q30, 35B45, 76D03

---

1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with the global regularity of solutions of the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equation (NSE):

$$\left\{\begin{array}{ll} \partial_t\boldsymbol{u}-\nu\Delta\boldsymbol{u}+(\boldsymbol{u}\cdot\nabla)\,\boldsymbol{u}+\nabla p=0, & \text{in } \boldsymbol{R}^3\times(0,T),\\ \nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{u}=0, & \text{in } \boldsymbol{R}^3\times(0,T),\\ \boldsymbol{u}=\boldsymbol{u}_0, & \text{on } \boldsymbol{R}^3\times\{t=0\}\,, \end{array}\right. \tag{1}$$

where $T>0$ is a given time, $\boldsymbol{u}=(u_1,u_2,u_3)$ is the velocity field, p is a scalar pressure, and $\boldsymbol{u}_0$ is the initial velocity field satisfying $\nabla\cdot\boldsymbol{u}_0=0$ in the sense of distributions.

The global existence of a weak solution $\boldsymbol{u}$ to (1) with initial data of finite energy is well-known since the work of Leary [19], see also Hopf

---

[*] Corresponding author
[1] uia.china@gmail.com

[15]. However, the issue of uniqueness and regularity of $\boldsymbol{u}$ was left open, and is still unsolved up to date. Pioneered by Serrin [25, 26] and Prodi [24], there have been a lot of literatures devoted to finding sufficient conditions to ensure the smoothness of $\boldsymbol{u}$. These conditions involve either

- the velocity $\boldsymbol{u}$, see [10, 11, 13, 25, 26, 27, 28], which states

$$\boldsymbol{u} \in L^{\alpha}(0, T; L^{\beta}(\boldsymbol{R}^3)), \quad \frac{2}{\alpha} + \frac{3}{\beta} = 1, \quad 3 \le \beta \le \infty; \tag{2}$$

- or several components of the velocity $\boldsymbol{u}$, the velocity gradient $\nabla \boldsymbol{u}$, the vorticity $\boldsymbol{\omega} = \operatorname{curl} \boldsymbol{u}$, or the pressure gradient ∇p, see [1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 5, 8, 9, 10, 12, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22, 23, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 39, 43, 44, 47, 48], and references cited therein.

We remark that many of the regularity criteria established in the above cited papers have been extended to the following three dimensional magnetohydrodynamic equations (MHD):

$$\begin{cases} \partial_t \boldsymbol{u} + (\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla)\, \boldsymbol{u} - (\boldsymbol{b} \cdot \nabla)\, \boldsymbol{b} - \Delta \boldsymbol{u} + \nabla p = 0, & \text{in } \boldsymbol{R}^3 \times (0, \infty), \\ \partial_t \boldsymbol{u} + (\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla)\, \boldsymbol{b} - (\boldsymbol{b} \cdot \nabla)\, \boldsymbol{u} - \Delta \boldsymbol{b} = 0, & \text{in } \boldsymbol{R}^3 \times (0, \infty), \\ \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u} = 0,\ \nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{b} = 0, & \text{in } \boldsymbol{R}^3 \times (0, \infty), \\ \boldsymbol{u} = \boldsymbol{u}_0,\ \boldsymbol{b} = \boldsymbol{b}_0, & \text{on } \boldsymbol{R}^3 \times \{t = 0\}\,. \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

Here $\boldsymbol{u} = (u_1, u_2, u_3)$ is the velocity field, $\boldsymbol{b} = (b_1, b_2, b_3)$ is the magnetic field, $\boldsymbol{u}_0$, $\boldsymbol{b}_0$ are the corresponding initial data, and p is a scalar pressure. The interested readers are referred to [14, 30, 31, 38, 40, 46] and references cited therein.

Motivated by [7] and [42], we consider in this paper the regularity criterion involving $\partial_1\partial_3 u_3$ and $\partial_2\partial_3 u_3$ only. Before stating the precise result, let us recall the weak formulation of (1).

Definition 1. *Let $\boldsymbol{u}_0 \in L^2(\boldsymbol{R}^3)$ with $\nabla \cdot u_0 = 0$, and $T > 0$. A measurable $\boldsymbol{R}^3$-valued vector $\boldsymbol{u}$ is said to be a weak solution of* (1) *if the following conditions hold:*

1. $\boldsymbol{u} \in L^{\infty}(0, T; L^2(\boldsymbol{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, T; H^1(\boldsymbol{R}^3))$;
2. *$\boldsymbol{u}$ solves* $(1)_{1,2}$ *in the sense of distributions; and*

3. *the energy inequality, that is,*

$$\|u(t)\|_2^2 + \nu \int_{t_0}^{t} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}(s)\|_2^2 \, ds \leq \|\boldsymbol{u}(t_0)\|_2^2 \,, \tag{4}$$

for almost every t_0 (including $t_0 = 0$) and every $t \geq t_0$.

Our regularity criterion now reads:

Theorem 2. *Let $\boldsymbol{u}_0 \in H^1(\boldsymbol{R}^3)$ with $\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u}_0 = 0$, and $T > 0$. Suppose $\boldsymbol{u}$ is the corresponding solution on $[0, T]$ of (1). If*

$$\partial_1\partial_3 u_3,\ \partial_2\partial_3 u_3 \ \in L^\alpha(0, T; L^\beta(\boldsymbol{R}^3)), \qquad \frac{2}{\alpha} + \frac{3}{\beta} = 2 + \frac{1}{\beta}, \qquad 1 < \beta \leq \infty, \tag{5}$$

then $\boldsymbol{u}$ is smooth on $(0, T)$.

Before proving this theorem in Section 2, we collect here some notations used throughout this paper and make some remarks on our result.

The usual Lebesgue spaces $L^q(\boldsymbol{R}^3)$ $(1 \leq q \leq \infty)$ is endowed with the norm $\|\cdot\|_q$. For a Banach space $(X, \|\cdot\|)$, we do not distinguish it with its vector analogues X^3, thus the norm in X^3 is still denoted by $\|\cdot\|$; however, all vector- and tensor-valued functions are printed boldfaced. We also denote by

$$\partial_i \varphi = \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x_i}, \qquad \partial_{ij}^2 \varphi = \partial_i \partial_j \varphi = \frac{\partial^2 \varphi}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}, \qquad 1 \leq i \leq 3$$

the first- and second-order derivatives of a function φ; by

$$\nabla_h \varphi = (\partial_1, \partial_2)\, \varphi,\ \Delta_h \varphi = \left(\partial_{11}^2 + \partial_{22}^2\right) \varphi$$

the horizontal gradient, horizontal Laplacian of φ.

Remark 3. *Noticing that*

$$\lim_{\beta \to 1^-} \left(2 + \frac{1}{\beta}\right) = 3,$$

we almost establish a Serrin-type regularity criterion via $\partial_1\partial_3 u_3$ and $\partial_2\partial_3 u_3$ only.

Remark 4. *Due to the orthogonal transformation invariance of NSE* (1)*, we easily extends our regularity criterion as*

$$\partial_i\partial_k u_k,\ \partial_j\partial_k u_k\ \in L^\alpha(0,T;L^\beta(\boldsymbol{R}^3)),\qquad \frac{2}{\alpha}+\frac{3}{\beta}=2+\frac{1}{\beta},\qquad 1<\beta\leq\infty,$$

where $\{i,j,k\}=\{1,2,3\}$*.*

Remark 5. *Our result seems to be more involved than that in [5] in the following sense. In [5], only conditions on* 1 *component is needed among the total* 9 *components of the velocity gradient tensor*

$$\partial\otimes\boldsymbol{u}=\nabla\boldsymbol{u}=\left[\partial_i u_j\right],$$

the ratio is $1/9$*. And our result requires regularity of* 2 *entries among the total* 27 *entries of the velocity Hessian tensor*

$$\partial^2\otimes\boldsymbol{u}=\nabla^2\boldsymbol{u}=\left[\partial^2_{ij}u_k\right],$$

the ratio being $2/27$*, which is less than* $1/9$*.*

Remark 6. *In classical and numerical analysis, we do not only rely on the graph of the differential to study properties of a function, but also utilize the graph of the Hessian to do so. In this point of view, our result is a complement to that in [5, 42].*

Remark 7. *Our proof in Section 2 is different from that in [5, 42], due to the our assumptions on the Hessian. We shall first bound* $\|\nabla_h\boldsymbol{u}\|_2$*, then estimate* $\|\nabla\boldsymbol{u}\|_2$*. In fact, tracking the proof of that in [5, 42] we will obtain a not-so-good result.*

2. Proof of the main result

In this section, we shall prove Theorem 2. First, let us recall and prove some technical lemmas.

The first one being a component-reducing technique due to Kukavica and Ziane [17].

Lemma 8. *Assume* $\boldsymbol{u}=(u_1,u_2,u_3)\in C_c^\infty(\boldsymbol{R}^3)$ *is divergence free. Then*

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3}u_i\partial_i u_j\Delta_h u_j\mathrm{d}x &= \frac{1}{2}\sum_{i,j=1}^{2}\int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3}\partial_i u_j\partial_i u_j\partial_3 u_3\mathrm{d}x\\ &\quad-\int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3}\partial_1 u_1\partial_2 u_2\partial_3 u_3\mathrm{d}x+\int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3}\partial_1 u_2\partial_2 u_1\partial_3 u_3\mathrm{d}x. \quad (6)\end{aligned}$$

And the next two lemmas are variants of multiplicative Sobolev inequalities in $\boldsymbol{R}^3$, similar in spirit to that in [5].

Lemma 9. *Let* $1 < r \leq 3$*. Assume* $f,\ g,\ h\ \in C_c^\infty(\boldsymbol{R}^3)$*. Then there exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that*

$$\int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} f\ g\ h\,\mathrm{d}x \leq C\,\|f\|_2^{\frac{r-1}{r}}\ \|\partial_3 f\|_{\frac{2}{3-r}}^{\frac{1}{r}}\ \|g\|_2^{\frac{r-1}{r}}\ \|\partial_1 g\|_2^{\frac{1}{2r}}\ \|\partial_2 g\|_2^{\frac{1}{2r}}\ \|h\|_2^{\frac{r-1}{r}}\ \|\partial_1 h\|_2^{\frac{1}{2r}}\ \|\partial_2 h\|_2^{\frac{1}{2r}}\ .$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} f\ g\ h\,\mathrm{d}x_1\mathrm{d}x_2\mathrm{d}x_3\\
&\leq \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^2} \max_{x_3}|f|\cdot\left(\int_{\boldsymbol{R}}|g|^2\,\mathrm{d}x_3\right)^{1/2}\cdot\left(\int_{\boldsymbol{R}}|h|^2\,\mathrm{d}x_3\right)^{1/2}\mathrm{d}x_1\mathrm{d}x_2\\
&\leq \left[\int_{\boldsymbol{R}^2}\left(\max_{x_3}|f|\right)^r\mathrm{d}x_1\mathrm{d}x_2\right]^{1/r}\cdot\left[\int_{\boldsymbol{R}^2}\left(\int_{\boldsymbol{R}}|g|^2\,dx_3\right)^{\frac{r}{r-1}}\mathrm{d}x_1\mathrm{d}x_2\right]^{\frac{r-1}{2r}}\\
&\quad\cdot\left[\int_{\boldsymbol{R}^2}\left(\int_{\boldsymbol{R}}|h|^2\,dx_3\right)^{\frac{r}{r-1}}\mathrm{d}x_1\mathrm{d}x_2\right]^{\frac{r-1}{2r}}\\
&\leq C\left[\int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3}|f|^{r-1}\,|\partial_3 f|\,\mathrm{d}x\right]^{1/r}\cdot\left[\int_{\boldsymbol{R}}\left(\int_{\boldsymbol{R}^2}|g|^{\frac{2r}{r-1}}\,\mathrm{d}x_1\mathrm{d}x_2\right)^{\frac{r-1}{r}}\mathrm{d}x_3\right]^{1/2}\\
&\quad\cdot\left[\int_{\boldsymbol{R}}\left(\int_{\boldsymbol{R}^2}|h|^{\frac{2r}{r-1}}\,\mathrm{d}x_1\mathrm{d}x_2\right)^{\frac{r-1}{r}}\mathrm{d}x_3\right]^{1/2}\\
&\leq C\,\|f\|_2^{\frac{r-1}{r}}\ \|\partial_3 f\|_{\frac{2}{3-r}}^{\frac{1}{r}}\ \|g\|_2^{\frac{r-1}{r}}\ \|\partial_1 g\|_2^{\frac{1}{2r}}\ \|\partial_2 g\|_2^{\frac{1}{2r}}\ \|h\|_2^{\frac{r-1}{r}}\ \|\partial_1 h\|_2^{\frac{1}{2r}}\ \|\partial_2 h\|_2^{\frac{1}{2r}}\ .
\end{aligned}$$

□

The same argument also yields

Lemma 10. *Let* $1 < r \leq 3$*. Assume* $f,\ g,\ h\ \in C_c^\infty(\boldsymbol{R}^3)$*. Then there exists a constant* $C > 0$ *such that*

$$\int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} f\ g\ h\,\mathrm{d}x \leq C\,\|f\|_2^{\frac{r-1}{r}}\ \|\partial_1 f\|_{\frac{2}{3-r}}^{\frac{1}{r}}\ \|g\|_2^{\frac{r-1}{r}}\ \|\partial_2 g\|_2^{\frac{1}{2r}}\ \|\partial_3 g\|_2^{\frac{1}{2r}}\ \|h\|_2^{\frac{r-1}{r}}\ \|\partial_2 h\|_2^{\frac{1}{2r}}\ \|\partial_3 h\|_2^{\frac{1}{2r}}\ .$$

Proof of Theorem 2.

Step 1. Preliminary reduction.

For any $\varepsilon \in (0, T)$, due to the fact that $\nabla \boldsymbol{u} \in L^2(0, T; L^2(\boldsymbol{R}^3))$, we may find a $\delta \in (0, \varepsilon)$, such that $\nabla \boldsymbol{u}(\delta) \in L^2(\boldsymbol{R}^3)$. Take this $\boldsymbol{u}(\delta)$ as initial data, there exists an $\tilde{\boldsymbol{u}} \in C([\delta, \Gamma^*), H^1(\boldsymbol{R}^3)) \cap L^2(0, \Gamma^*; H^2(\boldsymbol{R}^3))$, where $[\delta, \Gamma^*)$ is the life span of the unique strong solution, see [29]. Moreover, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{u}} \in C^\infty(\boldsymbol{R}^3 \times (\delta, \Gamma^*))$. According to the uniqueness result, $\tilde{\boldsymbol{u}} = \boldsymbol{u}$ on $[\delta, \Gamma^*)$. If $\Gamma^* \geq T$, we have already that $\boldsymbol{u} \in C^\infty(\boldsymbol{R}^3 \times (0, T))$, due to the arbitrariness of $\varepsilon \in (0, T)$. In case $\Gamma^* < T$, our strategy is to show that $\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$ remains bounded independently of $t \nearrow \Gamma^*$. The standard continuation argument then yields that $[\delta, \Gamma^*)$ could not be the maximal interval of existence of $\tilde{\boldsymbol{u}}$, and consequently $\Gamma^* \geq T$. This concludes the proof.

For this purpose, let us choose a τ sufficiently close to Γ^* such that

$$\int_\tau^{\Gamma^*} \left[\|(\partial_1, \partial_2)\, \partial_3 u_3(s)\|_\beta^\alpha + \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}(s)\|_2^2 \right] ds < \tilde{\varepsilon}, \tag{7}$$

where $\tilde{\varepsilon} > 0$ is small and will be chosen later on.

We shall first in Step 2 establish the bounds of $\|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$ for $t \in [\tau, \Gamma^*)$. The estimation of $\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$ is derived in Step 3.

Step 2. $\|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$ estimates.

Taking the inner product of $(1)_1$ with $-\Delta_h \boldsymbol{u}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 + \nu \|\nabla\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 = \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} (\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla)\, \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \Delta_h \boldsymbol{u} \mathrm{d}x \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} u_i \partial_i \Delta_h u_j \mathrm{d}x + \sum_{j=1}^{2} \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} u_3 \partial_3 u_j \Delta_h u_j \mathrm{d}x + \sum_{i=1}^{3} \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} u_i \partial_i u_3 \Delta_h u_3 \mathrm{d}x \\
&\equiv I_1 + I_2 + I_3.
\end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

Invoking Lemma 8, I_1 can be rewritten as

$$I_1 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j=1}^{2} \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} \partial_i u_j \partial_i u_j \partial_3 u_3 \mathrm{d}x - \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} \partial_1 u_1 \partial_2 u_2 \partial_3 u_3 \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} \partial_1 u_2 \partial_2 u_1 \partial_3 u_3 \mathrm{d}x. \tag{9}$$

For $I_2,\ I_3$, it follows by integrating by parts and noticing the divergence free condition $\nabla \boldsymbol{u} = 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned} I_2 &= \sum_{j=1}^{2} \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} u_3 \partial_3 u_j \Delta_h u_j \mathrm{d}x \\ &= -\sum_{j,k=1}^{2} \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} \partial_k u_3 \partial_3 u_j \partial_k u_j \mathrm{d}x + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,k=1}^{2} \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} \partial_3 u_3 \left(\partial_k u_j\right)^2 \mathrm{d}x, \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

$$\begin{aligned} I_3 &= \sum_{i=1}^{3} \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} u_i \partial_i u_3 \Delta_h u_3 \mathrm{d}x \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{3} \sum_{j=1}^{2} \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} \partial_j u_i \partial_i u_3 \partial_j u_3 \mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

Gathering (9),(10),(11) together, (8) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 + \nu \|\nabla\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 &\leq C \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} |\nabla_h u_3| \cdot |\nabla \boldsymbol{u}| \cdot |\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}| \, \mathrm{d}x + C \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} |\partial_3 u_3| \cdot |\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x \\ &\equiv J_1 + J_2. \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

We now apply Lemmas 9 and 10 with $\beta = \frac{2}{3-r}$ to bound $J_1,\ J_2$ respectively as

$$\begin{aligned} J_1 &= C \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} |\nabla_h u_3| \cdot |\nabla \boldsymbol{u}| \cdot |\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}| \, \mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq C \|\nabla_h u_3\|_2^{\frac{2(\beta-1)}{3\beta-2}} \|\nabla_h \partial_3 u_3\|_\beta^{\frac{\beta}{3\beta-2}} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^{\frac{2(\beta-1)}{3\beta-2}} \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^{\frac{2(\beta-1)}{3\beta-2}} \|\nabla\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^{\frac{2\beta}{3\beta-2}}, \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

$$\begin{aligned} J_2 &= C \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} |\partial_3 u_3| \cdot |\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}|^2 \, \mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq C \|\partial_3 u_3\|_2^{\frac{2(\beta-1)}{3\beta-2}} \|\partial_1 \partial_3 u_3\|_\beta^{\frac{\beta}{3\beta-2}} \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^{\frac{4(\beta-1)}{3\beta-2}} \|\nabla\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^{\frac{2\beta}{3\beta-2}} \\ &\leq C \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^{\frac{6(\beta-1)}{3\beta-2}} \|\partial_1 \partial_3 u_3\|_\beta^{\frac{\beta}{3\beta-2}} \|\nabla\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^{\frac{2\beta}{3\beta-2}}, \end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

where in the last inequality, we use the divergence free condition $\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u} = 0$.

Substituting (13), (14) into (12), we obtain by Young inequality that

$$\frac{1}{2}\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 + \nu \|\nabla\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \leq C \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^{\frac{4(\beta-1)}{3\beta-2}} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^{\frac{2(\beta-1)}{3\beta-2}} \|(\partial_1, \partial_2)\, \partial_3 u_3\|_\beta^{\frac{\beta}{3\beta-2}} \|\nabla\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^{\frac{2\beta}{3\beta-2}}$$

$$\leq \quad C \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\|_2 \|(\partial_1, \partial_2)\, \partial_3 u_3\|_\beta^{\frac{\beta}{2(\beta-1)}} + \frac{\nu}{2} \|\nabla \nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 ,$$

i.e.

$$\frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 + \nu \|\nabla \nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \leq C \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\|_2 \|(\partial_1, \partial_2)\, \partial_3 u_3\|_\beta^{\frac{\beta}{2(\beta-1)}} . \tag{15}$$

Integrating this inequality over $[\tau, t]$, for any $t \in [\tau, \Gamma^*)$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} &\|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2^2 + \nu \int_\tau^t \|\nabla \nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}(s)\|_2^2 \, \mathrm{d}s \\ &\leq \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}(\tau)\|_2^2 + C \int_\tau^t \|(\partial_1, \partial_2)\, \partial_3 u_3(s)\|_\beta^{\frac{\beta}{2(\beta-1)}} \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}(s)\|_2^2 \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}(s)\|_2 \, \mathrm{d}s. \end{aligned} \tag{16}$$

Young inequality then implies

$$\begin{aligned} \sup_{\tau \leq t < \Gamma^*} \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2^2 \quad \leq \quad & \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}(\tau)\|_2^2 \\ & + C \sup_{\tau \leq t < \Gamma^*} \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2^2 \cdot \int_\tau^{\Gamma^*} \left[\|(\partial_1, \partial_2)\, \partial_3 u_3(s)\|_\beta^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}} + \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}(s)\|_2^2 \right] ds. \end{aligned}$$

Hence if $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ in (7) is choose so that

$$C \tilde{\varepsilon} < \frac{1}{2},$$

we see

$$\sup_{\tau \leq t < \Gamma^*} \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2^2 \leq 2 \|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}(\tau)\|_2^2 . \tag{17}$$

Step 3. $\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$ estimates.

Taking the inner product of $(1)_1$ with $-\Delta \boldsymbol{u}$ in $L^2(\boldsymbol{R}^3)$, we see

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{dt} \|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 + \nu \|\Delta \boldsymbol{u}\|_2^2 \quad &= \quad \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} (\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \boldsymbol{u}) \cdot \Delta \boldsymbol{u} \mathrm{d}x \\ &= \quad \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} (\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \boldsymbol{u}) \cdot \Delta_h \boldsymbol{u} \mathrm{d}x + \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} (\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \boldsymbol{u}) \cdot \partial_{33}^2 \boldsymbol{u} \mathrm{d}x \\ &\equiv \quad K_1 + K_2. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

The term K_1 can be dominated similarly as in Step 2, and we find

$$\begin{aligned} K_1 &= \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} (\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla \boldsymbol{u}) \cdot \Delta_h \boldsymbol{u} \mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq C \left\|(\partial_1, \partial_2)\, \partial_3 u_3\right\|_\beta^{\frac{\beta}{2(\beta-1)}} \left\|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^2 \left\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2 + \frac{\nu}{4} \left\|\Delta \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Meanwhile for K_2, we have, by integrating by parts and noticing the divergence free condition $\nabla \cdot \boldsymbol{u} = 0$, that

$$\begin{aligned} K_2 &= \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} (\boldsymbol{u} \cdot \nabla)\, \boldsymbol{u} \cdot \partial_{33}^2 \boldsymbol{u} \mathrm{d}x \\ &= \sum_{i,j=1}^{3} \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} \partial_3 u_i \partial_i u_j \partial_3 u_j \mathrm{d}x \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{3} \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} \partial_3 u_i \partial_i u_j \partial_3 u_j \mathrm{d}x + \sum_{j=1}^{3} \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} \partial_3 u_3 \partial_3 u_j \partial_3 u_j \mathrm{d}x \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{2} \sum_{j=1}^{3} \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} \partial_3 u_i \partial_i u_j \partial_3 u_j \mathrm{d}x - \sum_{j=1}^{3} (\partial_1 u_1 + \partial_2 u_2)\, \partial_3 u_j \partial_3 u_j \mathrm{d}x. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Hölder inequality, interpolation inequality, Sobolev inequality and Young inequality yields

$$\begin{aligned} K_2 &\leq C \int_{\boldsymbol{R}^3} |\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}| \cdot |\nabla \boldsymbol{u}|^2 \,\mathrm{d}x \\ &\leq C \left\|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2 \left\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_4^2 \\ &\leq C \left\|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2 \left\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^{1/2} \left\|\Delta \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^{3/2} \\ &\leq C \left\|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^4 \left\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^2 + \frac{\nu}{4} \left\|\Delta \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^2 . \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

Now, replacing (19), (20) into (18), we get

$$\frac{d}{dt} \left\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^2 + \nu \left\|\Delta \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^2 \leq C \left\|(\partial_1, \partial_2)\, \partial_3 u_3\right\|_\beta^{\frac{\beta}{2(\beta-1)}} \left\|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^2 \left\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2 + C \left\|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^4 \left\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^2 .$$

Thanks to (17), we obtain further that

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt} \left\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^2 + \nu \left\|\Delta \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^2 &\leq C \left\|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}\right\|^2 \left[1 + \left\|(\partial_1, \partial_2)\, \partial_3 u_3\right\|_\beta^{\frac{\beta}{\beta-1}} \left\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^2\right] \\ &\quad +4C \left\|\nabla_h \boldsymbol{u}(\tau)\right\|_2^4 \left\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}\right\|_2^2 , \quad \text{on } [\tau, \mathit{\Gamma}^*). \end{aligned}$$

Invoking Gronwall inequality then implies $\|\nabla \boldsymbol{u}(t)\|_2$, $t \in [\tau, \mathit{\Gamma}^*)$ is uniformly bounded, as desired. This completes the proof of Theorem 2. □

References

[1] H. Beirão da Veiga, *A new regularity class for the Navier-Stokes equations in $\boldsymbol{R}^n$,* Chinese Ann. Math. Ser. B **16** (1995), 407–412.

[2] H. Beirão da Veiga, L.C. Berselli, *On the regularizing effect of the vorticity direction in incompressible viscous flows,* Differential Integral Equations **15** (2002), 345–356.

[3] L.C. Berselli, G.P. Galdi, *Regularity criteria involving the pressure for the weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations,* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **130** (2002), 3585–3595.

[4] C.S. Cao, *Sufficient conditions for the regularity to the* 3*D Navier-Stokes equations,* Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **26** (2010), 1141–1151.

[5] C.S. Cao, E.S. Titi, *Global regularity criterion for the* 3*D Navier-Stokes equations involving one entry of the velocity gradient tensor,* arXiv: 1005.4463 [math. AP] 25 May 2010.

[6] C.S. Cao, E.S. Titi, *Regularity criteria for the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations,* Indiana Univ. Math. J. **57** (2008), 2643–2661.

[7] C.S. Cao, J.H. Wu, *Two new regularity criteria for the* 3*D MHD equations,* J. Differential Equations **248** (2010), 2263–2274.

[8] D. Chae, J. Lee, *Regularity criterion in terms of pressure for the Navier-Stokes equations,* Nonlinear Anal. TMA **46** (2001), 727–735.

[9] P. Constantin, C. Fefferman, *Direction of vorticity and the problem of global regularity for the Navier-Stokes equations,* Indiana Univ. Math. J. **42** (1993), 775–789.

[10] L. Escauriaza, G. Seregin, V. Šverák, *Backward uniqueness for parabolic equations,* Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal. **169** (2003), 147–157.

[11] E.B. Fabes,B.F. Jones, N.M. Riviére, *The initial value problem for the Navier-Stokes equations with data in L^p,* Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **45** (1972), 222–240.

[12] J.S. Fan, S. Jiang, G.X. Ni, *On regularity criteria for the n-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations in terms of the pressure,* J. Differential Equations **244** (2008), 2963–2979.

[13] Y. Giga, *Solutions for semilinear parabolic equations in L^p and regularity of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes system,* J. Differential Equations **62** (1986), 186–212.

[14] C. He, Z. Xin, *On the regularity of weak solutions to the magnetohydrodynamic equations,* J. Differential Equations **213** (2005), 235–254.

[15] E. Hopf, *Üer die Anfangswertaufgabe für die hydrodynamischen Grundgleichungen,* Math. Nachr. **4** (1951), 213-231.

[16] J.M. Kim, *On regularity criteria of the Navier-Stokes equations in bounded domains,* J. Math. Phys. **51** (2010), 053102.

[17] I. Kukavica, M. Ziane, *Navier-Stokes equations with regularity in one direction.* J. Math. Phys. **48** (2007), 065203.

[18] I. Kukavica, M. Ziane, *One component regularity for the Navier-Stokes equations.* Nonlinearity **19** (2006), 453–469.

[19] J. Leray, *Sur le mouvement d'un liquide visqueux emplissant l'espace.* Acta Math. **63** (1934), 193–248.

[20] J. Neustupa, A. Novotný, P. Penel, *An interior regularity of a weak solution to the Navier-Stokes equations in dependence on one component of velocity,* Topics in Mathematical Fluid Mechanics, Quaderni di Matematica, Dept. Math., Seconda University, Napoli, Caserta, Vol. 10, pp. 163–183 (2002); see also *A remark to interior regularity of a suitable weak solution to the Navier-Stokes equations,* CIM Preprint No. 25, 1999.

[21] J. Neustupa, P. Penel, *Anisotropic and geometric criteria for interior regularity of weak solutions to the 3D NavierCStokes equations,* in Mathematical Fluid Mechanics (Recent Results and Open Problems), Advances in Mathematical Fluid Mechanics, edited by J. Neustupa, and P. Penel (Birkhäuser, Basel-Boston-Berlin, (2001), pp. 239–267.

[22] P. Penel, M. Pokorný, *On anistropic regualarity criteria for the solutions to 3D Navier-Stokes equations,* J. Math. Fluid Mech. doi:10.1007/s00021-010-0038-6.

[23] P. Penel, M. Pokorný, *Some new regularity criteria for the NavierCStokes equations containing the gradient of velocity,* Appl. Math. **49** (2004), 483–493.

[24] G. Prodi, *Un teorema di unicitá per le equazioni di Navier-Stokes,* Ann. Mat. Pura Appl. **48** (1959), 173–182.

[25] J. Serrin, *On the interior regularity of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations,* Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **9** (1962), 187–191.

[26] J. Serrin, *The initial value problems for the Navier-Stokes equations,* in Nonlinear Problems, edited by R. E. Langer (University of Wisconsin Press, Madison, WI, (1963).

[27] H. Sohr, *Zur Regularitätstheorie der instationären Gleichungen von Navier-Stokes, (German) [On the regularity theory of the nonstationary Navier-Stokes equations]* Math. Z. **184** (1983), 359–375.

[28] H. Sohr, W. von Wahl, *On the regularity of the pressure of weak solutions of Navier-Stokes equations,* Arch. Math. (Basel) **46** (1986), 428–439.

[29] R. Temam, *Navier-Stokes equations, Theory and numerical analysis,* North-Holland, 1977.

[30] J.H. Wu, *Generalized MHD equations,* J. Differential Equations **195** (2003), 284–312.

[31] J.H. Wu, *Regularity criteria for the generalized MHD equations,* Comm. Partial Differential Equations **33** (2008), 285–306.

[32] Y, Zhou, *A new regularity criterion for the Navier-Stokes equations in terms of the direction of vorticity,* Monatsh. Math. **144** (2005), 251–257.

[33] Y. Zhou, *A new regularity criterion for the Navier-Stokes equations in terms of the gradient of one velocity component.* Methods Appl. Anal. **9** (2002), 563–578.

[34] Y. Zhou, *A new regularity criterion for weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations,* J. Math. Pures Appl. **84** (2005), 1496–1514.

[35] Y. Zhou, *Direction of vorticity and a new regularity criterion for the Navier-Stokes equations.* ANZIAM J. **46** (2005), 309–316.

[36] Y. Zhou, *On a regularity criterion in terms of the gradient of pressure for the Navier-Stokes equations in* $\boldsymbol{R}^n$, Z. Angew. Math. Phys. **57** (2006), 384–392.

[37] Y. Zhou, *On regularity criteria in terms of pressure for the Navier-Stokes equations in* $\boldsymbol{R}^3$, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **134** (2006), 149–156.

[38] Y. Zhou, *Regularity criteria for the* 3*-D MHD equations in terms of the pressure,* Internat. J. Non-Linear Mech. **41** (2006), 1174–1180.

[39] Y. Zhou, *Regularity criteria in terms of pressure for the* 3*-D Navier-Stokes equations in a generic domain,* Math. Ann. **328** (2004), 173–192.

[40] Y. Zhou, *Remarks on regularities for the 3D MHD equations,* Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. **12** (2005), 881–886.

[41] Y. Zhou, M. Pokorný, *On a regularity criterion for the Navier-Stokes equations involving gradient of one velocity component*, J. Math. Phys. **50** (2009), 123514.

[42] Y. Zhou, M. Pokorný, *On the regularity to the solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations via one velocity component*, Nonlinearity **23** (2010), 1097–1107.

[43] X.C. Zhang, *A regularity criterion for the solutions of* 3*D Navier-Stokes equations,* J. Math. Anal. Appl. **346** (2008), 336–339.

[44] Z.F. Zhang, Q.L. Chen, *Regularity criterion via two components of vorticity on weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations in* $\boldsymbol{R}^3$, J. Differential Equations **216** (2005), 470–481.

[45] Z.J. Zhang, *A Serrin-type regularity criterion for the Navier-Stokes equations via one velocity component*, to appear.

[46] Z.J. Zhang, *Remarks on the regularity criteria for generalized MHD equations,* J. Math. Anal. Appl. **375** (2011), 799–802.

[47] Z.J. Zhang, M. Lu, L.D. Ni, *Some Serrin-type regularity criteria for weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations,* submitted.

[48] Z.J. Zhang, *Two new regularity criteria for the* 3*D Navier-Stokes equations via two entries of the velocity gradient tensor,* submitted.